REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In connection with filing a Request for Continued Examination ("RCE"), the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following amendments and remarks. Claims 1, 5, 10, and 11 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-11 are pending.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0084292 filed by Pierce at al. (hereinafter "Pierce") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0088783 filed by DiPierro (hereinafter "DiPierro") in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0014633 filed by Gruber (hereinafter "Gruber").

Claim 1, as amended, recites the elements of an "attaching a digital signature to create a signature *representing an original signer of the SOAP message*" (emphasis added) and "a function of creating routing information in the SOAP header for the recipient of the SOAP message, the routing information representing an origination and a destination of the SOAP message." The amendments are supported, for example, by page 10, lines 7-9, page 12, lines 4-6, page 14, lines 10-12 and Fig. 8 of the Specification. A digital signature described in the present invention represents an original signer of a SOAP message and is used to prove the integrity of the SOAP message and to verify identification. Therefore, according to the present invention, signature encryption for a SOAP message can effectively protect against a possible risk of signer forgeries in web service security. The cited art fails to teach or suggest these elements related to a digital signature of an original signer of a SOAP message. Moreover, the cited art fails to teach or suggest elements related to routing information in a SOAP header.

Pierce fails to teach or suggest the above elements. In particular, paragraph [0086] of Pierce discloses that portions of the SOAP envelope may be signed as denoted by the sign elements "<Sign>" and "</Sign>." However, Pierce fails to expressly or inherently teach or suggest the elements of creating "a signature representing an original signer of the SOAP message," as recited in claim 1. In addition, Pierce fails to teach or suggest that routing information in the manner recited in claim 1 is included in the SOAP header. See Pierce, paragraph [0082] and [0083]. For example, as illustrated on page 8 of Pierce, clear text encryption, authentication, and sign data are included in the SOAP header but no routing

information is included in the SOAP header as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Pierce fails to teach or suggest the elements of "a function of creating routing information in the SOAP header for the recipient of the SOAP message, the routing information representing an origination and a destination of the SOAP message," as recited in claim 1. Consequently, Pierce fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 1.

Further, DiPierro fails to teach or suggest these missing elements. In contrast to the signature of the present invention, a digital signature disclosed in DiPierro does not represent an *original signer* of an encrypted file. Instead, the digital signature disclosed in DiPierro represents whether or not encrypted data is replaced with new data and comprises a string of authentication data generated from a string of actual data (see paragraph 41, 42, 44, 58, 71, 72 and FIG. 7). Therefore, according to DiPierro, the encryption of the digital signature can not protect against a possible risk of signer forgeries. In other words, DiPierro fails to teach or suggest elements that can protect against a possible risk of signer forgeries. Consequently DiPierro fails to teach or suggest the elements of "attaching a digital signature to create a signature representing an original signer of the SOAP message," as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, DiPierro fails to teach or suggest elements related to routing information in the SOAP header. Instead, DiPierro simply discloses that the digital signature may be stored in the file header, but fails to disclose elements related to routing information in the manner recited in claim 1. See DiPierro, paragraph [0039]. Consequently, for at least these reasons, DiPierro also fails to teach or suggest the elements of "a function of creating routing information in the SOAP header for the recipient of the SOAP message, the routing information representing an origination and a destination of the SOAP message," as recited in claim 1.

Further, Gruber fails to teach or suggest the missing elements. The Examiner has not cited and Applicants are unable to discern the portion of Gruber that allegedly teaches or suggests the elements of "attaching a digital signature to create a signature representing an original signer of the SOAP message," as recited in claim 1. In addition, Gruber relates to including an access start time and end time in the token but fails to disclose the routing information as recited in claim 1. See Gruber, paragraph [0011]. As a result, Gruber fails to teach or suggest the elements of "a function of creating routing information in the SOAP header

for the recipient of the SOAP message, the routing information representing an origination and a destination of the SOAP message," as recited in claim 1 as well.

Thus, in view of at least these foregoing reasons, Pierce in view of DiPierro in further view of Gruber fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

In regard to claims 2-4, these claims depend from claim 1 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons mentioned in connection with claim 1, these claims are patentable over Pierce in view of DiPierro in further view of Gruber because each of these claims depends on claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4 are respectfully requested.

In regard to claims 5, 10, and 11, these claims, as amended, recite analogous limitations to those in claim 1 Therefore, in view of at least the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1, Pierce in view of DiPierro in further view of Gruber fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 5, 10, and 11 as well. In addition, claims 6-9 are patentable over the cited art because each of these claims depends on claim 5. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-11.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims patentably define the subject invention over the cited references of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If Examiner believes a telephone conference would be useful in moving the case forward, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: April 29, 2008

By: _____
Eric S. Hyman, Registration No. 30,139

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted online via EFS Web to the Patent and Trademark Office, Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on 4-29, 2008.

Melissa Stead

Melissa Stead 4-29, 2008